

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/938,669	Applicant(s) PETERSEN, JENS	
	Examiner Carlos A. Azpuru	Art Unit 1615	

All Participants:

(1) Carlos A. Azpuru.

(2) Stanislaus Aksman.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Victoira A. Silcott.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5-12-06

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, first paragraph, new matter

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was suggested that applicant use the language found in the original specification at page 9, lines 24-25 when referring to the empirical formula of the polyacrylamide of the invention. The language inserted into the claims is considered new matter since the specification makes no reference to a backbone at all. Applicant did not agree to these changes and applicant's representatives were notified that a rejection would be mailed. .